REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11-13, 15-17 and 19 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-2, 8-9, 11-12 and 16 are amended and claims 7, 10 and 18 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action rejects the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over various combinations of U.S. Patent 6,904,610 to Bayrakeri et al. (hereafter Bayrakeri), U.S. Patent 5,805,763 to Lawler et al. (hereafter Lawler), U.S. Patent 6,018,372 to Etheredge, U.S. Patent 5,831,663 to Waterhouse et al. (hereafter Waterhouse), newly-cited U.S. Patent 5,880,720 to Iwafune et al. (hereafter Iwafune) U.S. Patent 5,734,853 to Hendricks et al. (hereafter Hendricks), U.S. Patent 6,101,180 to Donahue et al. (hereafter Donahue), U.S. Patent 6,314,572 to La Rocca et al. (hereafter La Rocca), U.S. Patent 6,169,543 to Wehmeyer et al. (hereafter Wehmeyer) and U.S. Patent No. 5,861,906 to Dunn et al. (hereafter Dunn). The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites transmitting a download request of environmental information inputted by the viewer from the TV to the server, transmitting the environmental information corresponding to the download request from the server to the TV, and <u>automatically setting environments of the TV based on the transmitted environmental information downloaded to the TV, the automatically setting the environments being performed by an environment changing program.</u> Independent claim 1 also recites that the transmitted

10

environmental information comprises information related to channel settings, broadcast reservation settings and screen color settings.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1. More specifically, the Office Action (dated July 13, 2006) states that Bayrakeri teaches executing the environment information downloaded to the TV. The Office Action then states that the claimed "executing" is the same as "processes". Bayrakeri merely discloses that a generated custom-IPG may be delivered from a head end to a set top box (STP). Bayrakeri does not teach or suggest <u>automatically setting environments of the TV</u>. Bayrakeri also does not teach or suggest automatically setting environments of the TV based on the transmitted environmental information downloaded to the TV, the automatically setting the environments being performed by an environment changing program. The other applied references do not teach or suggest these features for independent claim 1 missing from Bayrakeri. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 8 recites changing former environments into environment suitable for the viewer's taste by automatically setting environments of the TV based on the environments.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 8. Thus, independent claim 8 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 10 recites manually entering, by the viewer, a viewer's ID number that corresponds to a specific number of the viewer, and receiving environmental information selected by the viewer along with a server address and the viewer's ID number. Independent

claim 10 also recites storing the environmental information corresponding to the viewer's ID number, inquiring whether or not there is the viewer's environmental information based on the viewer's ID number included in the download request, and reading the environmental information corresponding to the viewer's ID number when the viewer's environmental information is inquired.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 10. Thus, independent claim 10 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 11 recites a controller for reading a menu from a memory, for displaying the menu to allow the user to select environmental information and for transmitting the selected environmental information along with a server address and a viewer's ID number to the server, the viewer's ID number being a specific number of the viewer that is input by a user,

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 11. Thus, independent claim 11 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 16 recites display means for providing the viewer with an initial menu for selecting the environmental information and network connecting means for transmitting the environmental information along with a server address and a viewer's ID number to the server through the network and downloading the environmental information from the server, the viewer's ID number being a specific number of the viewer that is input by a user.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 16. Thus, independent claim 16 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 18 recites the processor to perform receiving environmental information selected by a viewer along with a server address and a viewer's ID number, the viewer's ID number being a specific number of the viewer that is input by a user, and storing the environmental information corresponding to the viewer's ID number. Independent claim 18 also recites the processor to perform inquiring whether or not there is the viewer's environmental information based on the viewer's ID number included in the download request, and reading the environmental information corresponding to the viewer's ID number if the viewer's environmental information is inquired.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 18. Thus, independent claim 18 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 8, 10, 11, 16 and 18 define patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

For example, dependent claim 3 recites in the transmitting the download request of environmental information from the TV to the server, the download request includes a TV

address, the server address, the viewer's ID number and a download request code, and the viewer's ID number being a specific number of the viewer that is input by a user. The Office Action dated July 13, 2006 (on page 12) cites Hendricks FIG. 4b, element 928' and col. 17, lines 58-60 as teaching the claimed ID number. However, the cited section merely identifies a 16-bit field that identifies each set top terminal. This does not suggest the viewer's ID number being a specific number of the viewer that is input by a user. The other applied references do not teach or suggest these missing features. Thus, dependent claim 3 defines patentable subject matter at least for these additional reasons.

Additionally, dependent claim 5 recites determining whether or not the viewer is registered based on the viewer's ID number included in the environmental information received from the TV, and the viewer's ID number being a specific number of the viewer that is input by a user. The Office Action dated July 13, 2006 (on page 13) cites LaRocca's col. 8, lines 64-67 and col. 9, lines 1-10 as teaching a set-top ID. However, a set-top ID is not the viewer's ID number being a specific number of the viewer that is input by a user. The other applied references do not teach or suggest these missing features. Thus, dependent claim 5 defines patentable subject matter at least for these additional reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-3, 5-13 and 15-18 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the

application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned

attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is

hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and

please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah
Date: November 21, 2007
Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610